Wi

Dear Howard, 7/5/77

Your 7/1 mailing of ~~these~~ two 6/27 carbons here today, plus 6/30 memo

In your letter to Richard M. Rogers, Item 4., you refer to Civil Division records. I remind you of two lawsuits in which it should have figured, one I know it did. This one is La. v Shaw. The other is my 2569-70, pix of clothing. The name there to remember on this subject is Carl Eardley. Remember also there should be records of that crew driving to Baltimore for Fisher to steam them up. They were ready to throw the towel in.

Your Willens memo and letter to Buckley are about the same thing.

There are other Manchesterian candidates. Begin with what M would regard as poisonous in Epstein that might be of interest to the Kennedys. My recollection s of the Epsteink are not clear but I recall no criticism of any Kennedy. He was poisonous about Warren and he was crazy about the autopsy being rewritten after 1/20/64. What is not generally appreciated is that it is favorable to the FBI. And as opposed to the WC.

It is not unlikely that Ma. reached Willens through a contact like Kennedy people, office or DJ, or from the Archives, where Man. had an office. I have no reason to believe Willens is or was liberal. Example: the one time he came out of his shell was to appear on Panorama with Jones Harris to clobber Warren for withholding JEHoover's warnings. I was on the same show and produced from their records what had not been classified or withheld. And on the imposter question asked Willens why he did not get the Bolton Ford records when that was his responsibility. His non-response: ad hominem. So he is back in his shell and will at least for a while stay there. My point is they'll all opt self-service, and that can account for his help to Man.

So there are two Burkleys. The one of the secret records then still secret and the one who knew what was being said and had read the autopsy proctocol. Why should he have disputed the official story so soon and for Man?

On the panel, there should be records showing that John Roche, LBJ's intellectual in residence, had this idea. He wrote a column so stating. I'd duplicate this with the LBJ library... On the Scavengers quote and all the lawyers saying Bobby would not let them see the film: this was the popular mythology fostered very early, why I early latched onto the 4/30/64 Specter memo, which Specter wrote for Specter. I'm more inclined to believe that Willens did not set this straight for Kennedy but against Warren. They could thensee kickbacks for the staff, which was not about to tangle with the FBI. Who else but Warren? In this am I not consistent with the Willens of that PM chapter?

Another Civil guy in on these affairs in those days is named Jaffe.

What we have obtained in the King case about Civil and FOIA and me says they make Hoover into a liberal, relatively.

Motive for most of those people then and since is most likely first of all selfish and then, defensively, Warren was wrong, not me. He kept me from doing what I would have done had it not been for him.

At this moment you are now at home. I suggested that a Danish reporter speak to you. He has just told me he has not been able to reach you. I suggested you'd be in a law library and to phone after 5. Did I write your number down correctly: 904/743-5845.

Comes back to me that Manchester was working during the Commission period and had access then. His relationship with Willens can go back to there.

Best,